

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-66 were pending. In this amendment, claims 1, 6-7, 11, 24, 39, 42, 45, 48, and 51-66, are amended. Following entry of this amendment, claims 1-66 will be pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention, suggesting a new title, objected to certain text of the specification, rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-12, 24, 26, 39, 42, 45, 48 and 51-66 under 30 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,061,799 to Eldridge et al. (hereinafter "Eldridge") and objected to the balance of the claims as being dependent on rejected base claims. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that those claims would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.

Specification

Applicants have amended the title of the invention to more clearly recite the invention.

Applicants note that regarding item 4 of the Office Action, where O_{n-1} should be O_{n+1} , page 5, lines 6-7 of the specification as filed recites in part "The rest of the sub-objects (*e.g.*, the subset $[O_n, O_{n+1}, \dots O_q]$)." Paragraph [0013] of the U.S. Publication 20020083327 discloses "The rest of the sub-objects (*e.g.*, the subset $[O_n, O_{n-1}, \dots O_q]$)." Thus, the specification as filed is correct and paragraph [0013] of the U.S. Publication 20020083327 is in error. Applicants respectfully request appropriate correction.

35 USC §102 Rejections

The Office Action states that Eldridge teaches and describes a method for operating an access control system to camouflage a secret so as to be accessible by an authorized user yet protected against unauthorized access. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Eldridge discloses an authentication system where a user gains access to a network through the use of passwords and public and private keys. Eldridge discloses a server reading a client identifier from a medium and then compares the client identifier to a database on

the server. If the client is found, then the server obtains secret information from the medium. The user then enters a password. If the password matches passwords found on the servers database, then the authentication system uses the password and the secret information to generate authentication data, i.e. a key or identifier. The authentication system compares the key with a database of keys. If there is a match, access to the server is allowed. However, if there is no match is found the *authentication process ends* (Eldridge, Abstract, Figures 3A, 3B, 4, and 8, col. 1 line 65 through col. 3 line 10, col. 10 lines 23-54.).

Claims 1, 6, 11, 24, 39, 42, 45, 48, 52, 53-66

Claims 1, 6, 11, 24, 39, 42, 45, 48, 52, 53-66 as amended, are allowable over Eldridge as that reference fails to disclose or suggest each element of claims 1, 39, 42, 52, 55, 56, 59-66. For example, amended claims 1, 39, 42, 52, 55, 56, 59-66 recite in part “generating a bogus secret configured to camouflage said secret if said candidate password is not said password,” amended claims 11 and 45 recite in part “generating a bogus matrix configured to camouflage said matrix” if said candidate password is not said password which is not disclosed or suggested by Eldridge. In addition, amended claims 24, 48, 53, 54, 57, and 58 recite in part “generating bogus state information to camouflage said state information if said candidate password is not said password” which is not disclosed or suggested by Eldridge. On the contrary, Eldridge ends the authentication process if the password does not match the passwords stored in the database. Claims 1, 6, 39, 42, 52, 55, 56, 59-66 are thus patentably distinguished over Eldridge for at least the above reasons.

Dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 26

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1. Claims 7 and 10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 6. Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 11. Claim 26 depends from claim 24 and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed in relation to

Appl. No. 10/015,902
Amdt. dated July 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 8, 2005

PATENT

claim 24. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, and 26 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Please note the Attorney Docket No. for this case has changed from 028410-0017 to 020967-002020US.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Bart Sullivan
Reg. No. 41,516

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200 Fax: 415-576-0300
CBS:rgy
60531436 v1